

67
29
98
E 713

.M61

Copy 1

Adolph Meyer

5:0000

M. F. R

ANNEXATION OF THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

"I speak for the best and highest interests of the American people, and not for speculators. I speak for the laboring poor. I speak only what all the fathers of our freedom have told us to believe and act upon."

SPEECH

OF

HON. ADOLPH MEYER,
OF LOUISIANA,

IN THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 15, 1898.

WASHINGTON.

1898.

Mr. H. A. Smith

1713
(1713)

68483

SPEECH
OF
HON. ADOLPH MEYER.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. Res. 259) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States—

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana said:

Mr. SPEAKER: I have weighed carefully the arguments presented in the different reports by committees of Congress favoring annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States and especially the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. It seems to me that everything that could be said for annexation has been presented in these reports and also in the able and ingenious speech of the chairman of the committee. But, sir, I do not find in these enough to satisfy my judgment or to remove the strong and valid objections to the measure. Test these arguments and appeals by the logic of facts, and they fall to the ground.

HAWAII NOT ESSENTIAL AS A COALING STATION.

The most plausible of all the pleas for annexation is the claim that these islands would be necessary as a coaling station in this war now raging and for the future. Why, sir, this argument was fully and completely demolished by the speech of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DIXSMORE] on Saturday. He demonstrated by figures and authority that could not be denied that the route to Yokohama, Hongkong, and Manila, by the way of the Aleutian Islands, of Alaska, which is our own territory, is 800 miles nearer than by the way of Honolulu, that there is abundance of anchorage there, and that it is open there all the year.

Here you have your coaling station already provided to your hand. We have not improved it for this purpose, but then, after having for a number of years the right to perfect your coaling station at Pearl Harbor in the Sandwich Islands, you have demonstrated by your neglect that you did not deem the matter to be of any serious importance; and yet you have had, long ago, the opinion of military and naval experts as to the adoption of Pearl Harbor as a naval station.

THE USEFUL COLLIER.

Sir, there is a coaling station which we can use whenever we will, which we are now about to use for the monitors *Monterey* and *Monadnock*, and which all modern ships of war can use at will. It is the collier, the vessel specially adapted to carry coal. There is hardly a day in the Pacific when it can not be safely employed. You carry your coaling station with you. So, sir, there is no occasion for haste, none for hysterics, nor for a departure from our old and honored policies. We have a right to a coaling station at Pearl Harbor. We may improve it if we choose, and well have we paid for it in giving the freedom of our ports to Hawaiian products. But, sir, I rejoice to think that we are not

dependent on Hawaii for coal. As for it being used as a base of operations against the United States, I regard the idea as preposterous. What power would do so? What power could do so?

It is urged by the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee that Hawaii has violated her neutrality in our favor in this way, and that after the war is over, or before, she will be amenable by their displeasure. To which one, pray? Not Spain, for we will settle up all questions with Spain ere we finish the war. Who then is to punish Hawaii? Germany or France? Does any sane man suppose that on such a pretense or for such a reason as this Germany or France would singly risk a war with the United States?

HAWAII IS NO DANGER FROM FOREIGN POWERS.

Is there any man in our midst so ignorant of conditions to-day in Europe as to imagine Germany and France combining to chastise Hawaii and thereby provoking a war with the United States? Is Sedan forgotten? Is the capture and conquest of Alsace and Lorraine forgotten, or even forgiven? All this argument is based in the wildest and emptiest of chimeras and an utter ignorance of the relations, the jealousies, and the hates and rivalries of European States. In order to combine, nations must have a common interest.

UNMERITED ASSAULTS ON THE SPEAKER REBUKED.

The absence of any really valid arguments for annexation has driven its friends in other quarters than the House to violent and gross assaults upon those who differ with them. Individual gentlemen are bitterly and rancorously assailed because they decline to become partisans of this measure. They are even called traitors and disloyal. One of the most conspicuous victims of this species of assault is the Speaker of the House. Justly regarded as one of the ablest men of his party, its favorite repeatedly for one of the highest offices of our Government, the memory of his great services to his party and of his leadership has not availed to protect him in this House and his motives from being aspersed. And yet his only crime in the matter is that God having given him an intellect to weigh public questions, he has refused to jump at the crack of somebody's whip. I am not his defender. He does not need my help. I mention the fact merely to show the utter lack of fairness and wisdom on the part of those most active in favor of annexation, and their lack of fair and valid arguments. [Applause.]

But this is not all. We are told, sir, that the sugar trust is making the opposition to Hawaiian annexation. Sir, I speak for a population both white and black who are engaged in the production of cane sugar. We have no cause to love the sugar trusts. They are our competitors in the market. We grow and refine American sugars under many disadvantages growing out of a fluctuating and often unfair, inadequate revenue duty on raw sugars. The sugar trust reaches out its hand to Cuba, Demerara, Hawaii, the East, South, and the West for cheap raw sugars. It wants them duty free, if possible, and if not duty free, then as cheap as possible.

So, therefore, their interests and ours conflict. Does any man suppose that this trust which wants cheap sugars to refine from the West Indies, South America, and the East Indies would not welcome the introduction of cheap raw sugar from Hawaii? Their interest is all that way. I have not seen their hand in this fight, but if it does exert an influence it will be quietly and steadily

exerted in favor of annexation, for by annexation the Hawaiian product would be only grist to their mill.

It is suggested, I know, in the committee report that sugar would, in case of annexation, be refined on the Hawaiian Islands, and would come into competition with the refined sugar of the trust. Such an idea as this would not be entertained by anyone who had ever made a study of this subject. The refineries of the sugar trust, with their advantages of ample capital, skilled labor, established markets, and machinery of distribution, have nothing to fear from the petty, feeble competition of the Hawaiian refineries. There is no strife there. The sugar trust will get the raw sugars of Hawaii, if they want them at all, and will do the refining if it suits them to do so.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman from Louisiana allow me a question?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask the gentleman if the representative of the sugar trust is not now in Washington doing everything he can to defeat the Hawaiian annexation?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. No representative of the sugar trust is in Washington, to my knowledge. If there be one here, I have not met or heard of him.

Mr. GAINES. Who is the representative; what is his name?

Mr. SULZER. Oxnard.

Mr. GAINES. Where is his headquarters?

Mr. SULZER. I do not know; but it is published in the paper, in the Public Intelligencer, that you have on your desk, and it says it will be a hard fight to pass it in the Senate.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I know that Mr. Oxnard, whom the gentleman names, is a representative of a large beet-sugar industry and establishment in Nebraska, and also that he is interested in a very large agricultural and industrial plant in the State of Louisiana, which grows and manufactures cane sugar. Beyond that I know nothing of his connections or business affiliations.

Mr. SULZER. Does that influence the Louisiana delegation?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Speaking as far as I can for other members of the Louisiana delegation, I may safely say that they are influenced only so far as any member of the House can honorably be influenced by what he considers to be the interests of his constituents and the State he represents; and speaking for myself, I would say that if the State of Louisiana did not grow a single stalk of sugar cane or produce one pound of sugar, I would still maintain the position I do, because of the general principle involved in this resolution and the dangerous results that, in my judgment, would follow its enactment into law.

Mr. GAINES. Does the gentleman from New York mean to impute to me that because this paper was lying on my desk, which came in my morning mail, that my vote or position on this question was affected by it?

Mr. SULZER. Not at all. I say it is so charged in the paper, that the representative of the sugar trust is here and —

Mr. GAINES. If he is here trying to control legislation, he ought to be kicked out of town; and if he comes about me trying to control my vote, I will do it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DALZELL). Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I can not, for my time is brief.

Since the gentleman from New York has injected the name of Mr. Oxnard into this debate, I want to say I know he is opposed to the annexation resolution as a representative of the beet-sugar growers of this country and because their interests would be seriously and adversely affected. I believe always in fostering the industries of this country to the exclusion of those of other countries, and any project which would injure the progress of our agricultural interests, be it in relation to sugar or any other, can not secure my advocacy.

THE REAL FIGHT BETWEEN THE AMERICAN SUGAR FARMERS AND THE SUGAR TRUST.

No, sir; the fight is not there. There is no fight between the sugar trust and the Hawaiian sugar planters, who are clamorous for obtaining annexation and the American market. The real fight is between the cane-sugar growers of Louisiana and the beet-sugar growers of Nebraska, California, Colorado, and other States, who are interested in preserving the present status of affairs on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the enormous aggregation of capital and skill known as the sugar trust, with their natural allies in Hawaii and other tropical countries.

And right here permit me to read a protest which fortifies my position very clearly:

In the name of the farmers of America we respectfully appeal to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

First. We solemnly protest against hasty consideration in Congress of the treaty of annexation with Hawaii.

Second. We most urgently request that this subject be treated with the deliberation its vital importance deserves, thus affording the people of the United States sufficient time to inform the honorable Congress of their views.

Third. The farmers of this country oppose annexation. The sentiment among them against it is well-nigh unanimous. Their opposition is based upon the highest patriotism and most disinterested motives—the national welfare, political justice.

Fourth. In addition to these reasons for its defeat, the farmers recognize that annexation would seriously interfere with the otherwise promising development of our domestic beet-sugar and cane-sugar industry. Already the bare possibility of annexation has called a halt to numerous sugar-factory enterprises, which had promised a home market to farmers for a new and profitable crop. Defeat annexation and you remove the last obstacle in the way of enabling American agriculture, capital, and labor to produce the \$100,000,000 worth of sugar annually imported heretofore.

That the above truthfully and moderately expresses the earnest desires of the farmers of this nation will in due course be respectfully demonstrated to the complete satisfaction of the honorable Congress.

Done this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1897, and of the Independence of the United States the one hundred and twenty-first, and in the first year of the era of our independence of foreign sugar.

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN SUGAR GROWERS' SOCIETY.

By its officers:

R. M. ALLEN,

President, Ames, Nebr.

(Also president Nebraska Beet-Sugar Growers' Association.)

C. A. FARWELL,

Vice-President, New Orleans, La.

(Also president American Cane Growers' Association of the United States.)

HERBERT MYRICK,

Treasurer, 22 Lafayette Place, New York City.

(Also president Orange Judd Company, and editor American Agriculturist, of New York. Orange Judd Farmer, of Chicago, and the New England Homestead, of Springfield.)

B. W. SNOW,

Secretary, Marquette Building, Chicago, Ill.

(Statistician Orange Judd Farmer.)

[SEAL]

Why, sir, should Louisiana, why should the rising growth of the beet-sugar industry in this country, be sacrificed in order to swell the profits of a few planters in Hawaii? There are 500,000 people in Louisiana dependent on the sugar industry. The laborers are all blacks, 400,000 at least. You pretended to be their friends when you gave them suffrage. Now you give them a stone, and your heart goes out to a horde of Asiatics, Japanese, Chinese, and others working under contracts—a state of quasi slavery. The "man and brother" must go to the wall while you cultivate your new friends and find fresh materials wherewith to construct the temple of freedom. [Applause.]

Alas, sir, it is not a temple of freedom you seek to construct. You would not take Asiatics for that purpose. Your real scheme is to build an empire on the ruins of your old republic, of which you appear to be ashamed, and if you are to have an empire—a colonial system—you can not have a better start than a dependency composed of Asiatics and contract laborers.

RELATIONS OF THE ISLANDS TO THE UNITED STATES.

The relations of these islands to the United States have been a topic of interest to our statesmen for over seventy years. We have had several treaties of reciprocity with Hawaii, one of which is now in operation. We have had several treaties providing for annexation, one of which is now pending in the United States Senate. This treaty has been before the Senate a number of months and, report says, has been fully debated in executive session. It has not been confirmed, and it has not been finally rejected. It is reported that its friends are afraid to bring the treaty to a vote for fear that it will be rejected.

And thus, practically, the treaty project fails. That much, at least, we know, and now the friends of annexation have still another plan. It is to pass a joint resolution providing for annexation. This question is now before us. It may seem to some like a small matter—the annexation of 6,000 or 7,000 square miles of territory in all; and so to some persons at the time of our Revolution in 1775 a penny tax on tea seemed a very small matter; but it involved principles which led our fathers to combat the mightiest power in the world and evoked forces that will live forever. And so to-day this annexation of 7,000 square miles of territory—these little islands of the far Pacific—involves policies and consequences which may change the whole character of our Government. The present war with Spain may be prosecuted to a glorious conclusion, glorious for our arms, and far more glorious for the cause of humanity, for which we have prosecuted the war; and yet it may be that by wise councils this war may be so terminated and closed as to involve no serious change in our Government and general policy as a nation. But, sir, I apprehend that the annexation of Hawaii may involve consequences far more vast than the war with Spain. It will be a new departure. This fact can not be denied by any truthful and well-informed student of our history. We are treading on new and dangerous ground.

OUR OWN PEOPLE'S INTEREST SHOULD BE THE PRIME CONSIDERATION.

Mr. Speaker, I would not attempt to decry the ability of the advocates of annexation in and out of Congress. They have been insistent, earnest, laborious, ingenious, plausible in presenting their case, and for the most part I concede freely their patriotism and honesty of purpose. The report of the accomplished chairman

of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is a proof of what I have said, and I regret to be compelled to differ from its conclusions. The advocates of annexation have made the most of their case, but notwithstanding their reports, arguments, and the great mass of annexation literature they have presented, their case can not stand the test of common sense and fair logic. Of course we must study the interests of our own people as a paramount object. If we annex Hawaii, it must be done not on merely sentimental reasons, because some four or five thousand Americans have gone there to reside and make money, but for the substantial reason that the step is necessary to the 70,000,000 of this country as a military or naval necessity, or is advantageous to us commercially, and will entail no corresponding evils. Don Quixote has no place in this business.

I believe, sir, that this project would be very much weaker but for the suggestion put forth that this annexation is important to us right now in carrying on the war with Spain. It is also pretended that Hawaii, by allowing our war vessels to coal there, is incurring great danger from some European power. Therefore it is said we must annex her immediately. Both these propositions are flimsy pretenses. I deny them both. From what European power is Hawaii in danger? What power is going to assail her because forsooth she in some small way favors the United States? Spain, indeed, might and would do so, but she has not a single war vessel of any importance in the Pacific Ocean or even in Asiatic waters. She is not able to spare one ship to send to the Philippine Islands. Our own fleet is in possession at Manila. Will any European power venture to affront the United States by attacks upon Hawaii for alleged violation of neutrality? Of course that would involve a war with this country just as surely as if Hawaii were already formally annexed to us. Is Germany or France hunting for a quarrel with us? There is no sign of it—none whatever.

NOT NEEDED FOR NAVAL OPERATIONS.

But how does Hawaii help our naval operations in the Philippine Islands? How is she necessary to our success? Commodore Dewey did his work without help from Hawaii or any foreign power. It is true that we are sending him reinforcements of troops and supplies. There may be some little convenience in our ships stopping at Hawaii for additional coal, but this is really not necessary. The ships and the troops would go to Dewey just as surely as if the islands did not exist. Commercial instincts will secure him coal from citizens of neutral nations just as long as he is able to pay for it. The truth is that the reenforcement of Commodore Dewey is a mere matter of time and administration. Soon it will be un fait accompli. He will be master of the situation, able to occupy the city of Manila and the Island of Luzon and capture the Spanish forces long before an annexation resolution can pass the two Houses of Congress.

The capture of Manila and the destruction of the Spanish fleet was a glorious feat of arms, and we are all proud and glad of it; but if these Philippine Islands had not been assailed by Commodore Dewey our operations in the Antilles would have gone on all the same. It is there that conclusions are to be finally tried between the United States and Spain. The conquest of Cuba and Puerto Rico by our arms is essential. Hawaii is wholly unessential to our operations in the Atlantic or in the Pacific. I repeat,

sir, that Hawaiian annexation has nothing to do with the case. The scheme of annexation was started long, long ago and defended for reasons and from motives which have nothing to do with our present war with Spain. Sir, I protest against any attempt to use and pervert the patriotic feelings of our people at this time and their desire to free Cuba into an argument for annexing the Hawaiian Islands. If it be true, as some friends of annexation pretend, that Japan and this or that European nation have fixed a greedy eye upon these islands, then this step of annexation, if it had any effect at all, would only tend to array new enemies against us. [Applause.]

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUR COUNTRY A SOURCE OF PRIDE.

Sir, I take pride in the growth and development of this country. I take pride in the fact that we have made great acquisitions of territory and that Democratic Administrations and Southern statesmen have had the leading part in promoting them. Well do I recall the fact that Thomas Jefferson, a Democratic President, acquired the vast Louisiana Territory, out of which many States, including my own State, have been carved and grown into splendid communities. I remember also that New England, which now seems to favor Hawaiian annexation, was largely hostile to the acquisition of Louisiana, and that some of her politicians threatened disunion on that occasion as a mode of resistance. The alternative to the Democratic policy of that day was the barrier of a great European colony, a new France or a Dominion of England interposed as an obstacle to our frontier progress and to the freedom of the Mississippi River. I remember in our history the expedition of Lewis and Clarke, which secured our title to Oregon.

I remember the acquisition of Florida, the acquisition of Texas, California, New Mexico—all the work of Democratic Administrations. I can not pause to dwell upon the effects and consequences of these grand acquisitions of territory upon our national growth and present rank as one of the great powers of the world. But, sir, these acquisitions were promoted by wise statesmen, who could compute cost and consequences. It was not the mere vulgar love of conquest. Look through all these grand acquisitions of territory, so potent as steps in our history and progress, and you find two attendant facts—perhaps I ought to say principles. One was that the territory was coterminous with our own. Another fact was that the existing population was so small that it would be an easy matter to fill these territories up with our own people. “Westward the star of empire took its way.” As the American people pushed forward their emigration the savage gave way; they carried men of their own blood and race, their own institutions, the schoolhouse, the church, the free press, the trial by jury, representative government—all the muniments of liberty.

The acquisition of the Louisiana Territory gave us homes for our enterprising people, and ultimately communities as States well fitted to enter our system of States, fitted to augment, expand, and strengthen the Union. These States have not proved a weight or a burden or an expense or a curse to us. They have been an added glory and safeguard to the Republic. The same is true of all our acquisitions save one. These lands are full of Americans—forceful, free, energetic, intelligent, liberty-loving. They speak our tongue. They think like the people of the old

thirteen States and like the people who have populated the Northwest Territory given by Virginia to the Union. It is barely necessary for me to glance at these facts, for all in my hearing are familiar with them.

I have spoken of one exception. There was just one acquisition made by a statesman, and an ableman, Mr. Seward, which rests on different grounds. There is far less to be said for the acquisition of Alaska than any other of our Democratic acquisitions. The country, indeed, is large. It cost us only \$7,000,000; but while we are not burdened there with a large alien population, it has no soil fitted for agriculture or for homes. It may have some advantages besides a precarious seal industry and a gold production; but it is not coterminous and it adds nothing to the strength of the Republic. It is doubtful whether Mr. Seward would ever have entertained the project at all but for the idea that some day the Dominion of Canada would enter our Union and that it might be well to have Alaska for a geographical effect upon the map. The acquisition may be more beneficial in the future, but as it is not coterminous it would be a source of weakness but for the growing good feeling between Great Britain and the United States.

THE TRUE LINE OF STATESMANSHIP.

I think that I ought here to recall the fact that at the time when Mexico lay at our mercy, when in 1848 we could have taken that whole country, and some of our politicians actually proposed to do so, we stopped short at the true line of statesmanship. Our ancestors had the great and admirable wisdom of moderation. The traditions of Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton, the wise counsels of Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, had then a spell and a power for the American mind. We took from Mexico only those northern provinces of New Mexico and California which lay in the natural pathway of our progress and which by reason of a very scanty Mexican population were capable of being filled up by Americans, as they have been. They were easily assimilated to our own system, California especially. How wise this policy has proved! We left to Mexico all those portions of her country which were well populated by her own people.

MODERATION AND JUSTICE SHOULD DOMINATE.

We did not seek to incorporate them. A small strip, comparatively unsettled, known later as the "Gadsden purchase," was acquired subsequently by treaty in order to promote the construction of the Pacific railway. But we took in no large element of populationspeaking a different language and cherishing essentially different institutions from our own. I admire this moderation, this spirit of justice and statesmanship that dominated in that hour. The Republic of Mexico has great resources. After many trials and sad hours I rejoice to think that she is rapidly progressing and is happily prosperous under the conduct of a great and wonderful man, who deserves to rank among the foremost statesmen of the day and as a benefactor to a people who are our neighbors and friends. With them we have large and growing trade relations from which both countries are deriving profit, and which in the future will yield untold and only half-imagined benefits to both nations. Will any man be so foolish or wicked as to assert that it would be better to have incorporated Mexico as a province or a dependency?

This hasty review of the past, and I make it briefly because it is only necessary to allude to it, throws a broad light upon our present situation and our duty at this time. The present proposition is different from any we have ever had in the past. Even the case of Mexico in 1848 was widely different. Mexico was not densely populated. Her productions and resources were very great. Her future was beyond question. She was capable of supplying a very large product of sugar. She was then and is now capable of supplying the whole world with coffee of a quality equal to the best. Her capacities of production and her varieties of soil and climate in many respects made her a far more desirable acquisition than Hawaii, even if Hawaii were equally near and had an equal area. Mexico is a hundredfold richer.

HAWAII'S LIMITED DOMAIN.

But, leaving out the case of Mexico, compare the acquisition of Hawaii with the territorial acquisitions of the past. Compare the grand acquisitions of virgin lands, of grand areas of prairies, and forests of unoccupied lands with the pitiful area and meager opportunities of these little islands, thrown up by some volcanic action in the Pacific Ocean. Seven thousand square miles all told, surrounded by water and 2,200 miles away! A country hardly a fifth the size of Ohio, largely mountainous and uninhabitable, with no vacant or unoccupied lands, no opportunities for homes for our people, and already filled up full and running over and with Kanakas and Asiatics. Am I wrong as to this? I read from the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the following facts and figures:

The census of 1896 shows the population to be 109,020.

In round numbers the different nationalities are represented as follows:

Native Hawaiians.....	31,000	Americans.....	3,000
Japanese.....	24,400	British.....	2,200
Portuguese.....	15,100	Germans.....	1,400
Chinese.....	21,600	Norwegians and French.....	479
Part Hawaiian and part foreign blood.....	8,400	All other nationalities.....	1,055

The percentage of Americans and Europeans by birth or descent is here stated at 22, but this includes the Portuguese. I can not regard these as homogeneous. The European population are not united, small as they are, but are discordant, and only 3,000 out of 78,000 of those of foreign parentage or descent are Americans. The great bulk are Asiatics; yet Americans have had ample opportunities to settle there. They have not been interfered with nor oppressed. Why are there so few of them in Hawaii? I can only suppose that the Americans do not care to go there for lack of the opportunities that they have in their own country. The islands seem to attract the overcrowded populations of Asia, the class of people who can live and work in a hot climate for a few cents a day and in a low scale of life.

What are we to do with these Asiatics or with the Portuguese? You can not well ship them back to their own countries. Are you going to shut down on all Japanese immigration, or are you going to throw over them all the agis of American citizenship? Do you propose to admit as a State a country with an overwhelming proportion of Asiatics and Polynesians and only 3 per cent of Americans? Do you propose to shut Hawaii out as a State of the Union and keep her as a dependency? What advantage are you to derive from assuming this burden? With every

advantage to be derived from reciprocity treaties the total estimated area of land under cane cultivation is only 67,849 acres. The sugar exports have reached 292,083,589 pounds. But for the right to export sugar freely and duty free to the United States, and the American duties on all other foreign sugar—a great boom for somebody's benefit and a great loss to our own revenue—these islands would have to face a far different state of affairs.

A COLONIAL SYSTEM INCONSISTENT WITH OUR GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEM.

Disguise it as you may by ingenious phrases or specious pleas of military necessity, we are confronted with the grave question, Shall we enter upon a colonial system such as that of England, such as that which has been the curse and disgrace of Spain, such as that which burdens France and threatens to involve Germany and Italy in war with other powers—I might say a system that threatens to involve all Europe in war? Under this seeking out for colonies Africa has been partitioned, divided up, and now these great countries are quarreling over the spoils. With monarchical governments or governments only nominally republican, but really despotic or monarchical, this system of colonies, however burdensome, however tending to conflicts, may be pursued without a shock to their systems of government.

But with us the case is different. Our whole system is founded on the right of the people—all the people—to participate in the Government. If we annex Hawaii, we must soon admit the country as a State of the Union, with only 3 per cent of the population Americans, or we must keep the islands as a dependency—a sort of proconsulate where we can maintain rich men's sons in office and grandeur, or provide for needy and profligate politicians, such as those who for long years after the war scourged, robbed, and desolated the Southern States. At present there is no party bold enough to advocate the idea of admitting Hawaii as a State of the Union, whatever design they may propose in their hearts. They do not propose to make the Kanakas and Asiatics the equals in political power with New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois. No! The plan is to have and keep Hawaii as a colony or dependency.

NO CONCEALMENTS SHOULD BE MADE.

Now, sir, if this be the design, let it be frankly and honorably avowed. Let us have no fraud or deception practiced upon the people. Let all be plain sailing. If we are to change our entire system and policy as a confederated republic and go in for a grand, colonial, and imperial system, let the issue be fairly propounded. Let the people see what they are to give up and what they are to gain by it. Above all, let us consider that it is the first step that costs. We can not stop with these petty islands of Hawaii. To do so would be a national humiliation. If we are to run a race for the acquisition of colonies with the European governments—for colonies with a population alien in race, language, religion, everything—let us not do things on a small scale. We must not fall behind Italy, France, Germany, countries inferior to us in wealth and population. Sir, I warn you that you can not ever enter on such a policy as this and stop short at Hawaii. You can not stop. Still less can you go backward in your tracks.

I have made no reference to the great Government of Russia. Ambitious as her rulers may be, ready and anxious for acquisitions, and a great military power as she is, Russia seeks only con-

tiguous acquisitions—countries adjoining her own. These she conquers or annexes, populates them, if there be room, and at any rate governs them by a strong hand. She seems to have a wonderful faculty in assimilating foreign countries that she conquers, as remarkable, indeed, as the Roman Empire of old, and so far there is no sign of decay. But Russia is a monarchy—a grand Empire with a gigantic army. Her system of government is not a representative one like ours. She has no free institutions. But with all this she acquires no colonies. The only colony she ever had—I mean Alaska—she sold to this country long ago. It was a wise act for her to do.

ABANDONMENT OF OLD SYSTEM UNWISE.

So the question presses on us, Shall we abandon our old system and adopt the colonial system, with all its consequences? Is it a necessity for us at this time? Is it wise? Is it calculated to promote liberty and free institutions, or does it tend to consolidation and empire? Would an empire, great though it might be, prove better for our people than the free institutions which have made us the first of the nations in wealth and progress?

If this question can be fairly put and considered by the American people, I shall not fear the response. I admit that men's minds are disturbed by the excitement of the war with Spain, but there is reason and method enough left to guide our people to a safe conclusion. We can carry on a war with Spain, I hope, with success and yet not surrender our system of free government.

NO OTHER POWER WILL INTERFERE.

One of the arguments usually urged in favor of annexing Hawaii is that if we do not take these islands at once, some other power will do so. There is no warrant for this assertion. There is no power on the globe that does not know that the Hawaiian Islands are forbidden fruit. They know that this country would not permit it. They each and all know that there is nothing in these islands to compensate the cost of a war with the United States, even if it should be successful. There have indeed been periods in the remote past when European powers have interfered with the independence of the Hawaiian Islands, but that time has long since gone by. The European powers now fully recognize the fact that the United States would regard this as a hostile act. They have had ample notice. Their position is apparent in the documents of this report. It is summed up well at page 81 by Lord Palmerston, speaking nearly half a century ago. He said that the British Government desired the Hawaiian people to preserve national independence. "If they were unable to do so, he recommended receiving a protectorate government under the United States or by becoming an integral part of that nation."

This attitude of England has been repeatedly and most frankly stated. The paramount influence of the United States and her moral right to control the destinies of the islands has been steadily recognized. It is a fixed policy and will not be varied by England. No other European power has proposed a different policy. Japan disavows any idea of annexation. Her interests are those of peace with this country. Japan and the United States have in common a great paramount interest in Asia in enlarged trade and free intercourse for all nations. Japan is not going to quarrel with the United States or to pursue an aggressive policy in respect to Hawaii. In a word, the United States are free in respect to Hawaii

from all foreign complications. This effort to provoke our people to resentment of fancied wrongs, and then to annexation, in order to show what we can do if we will, has no adequate foundation or justification. It is a mere trick in the game of men who have a profit to make by annexation. It is a cheap, transparent device, and should not influence us for a single moment.

I come now to the point that those islands may be made the basis of an attack upon the Pacific coast. We have already a right to establish a coaling station at Pearl Harbor. We have not improved upon our right which exists by and under our reciprocity treaty with Hawaii. Of course we can improve this harbor at any time we please and fortify it if we desire to do so. I admit the advantage of coaling stations at Hawaii, at the Philippine Islands, and on the Asiatic coast. We ought to seek such a concession from China, and probably it could be readily obtained. China has made such concessions to less friendly nations than our own. But the fact stands that up to this time nothing has been done.

Mr. Speaker, I question the assertion that any power can make the Hawaiian Islands with success a base of hostile operations against our Western coast. England does not need it for this purpose. She has her own base at Esquimaux. She has British Columbia and Vancouver Island. The other countries are so remote from our Pacific shores that it seems to me idle to suppose that France, Germany, Russia, or Japan can direct naval or military operations against our Western coast. Gentlemen who make this argument appear to me to forget that our Navy is being rapidly developed and that the Pacific coast States are about to become the dominant force on the Pacific coast. That they can be successfully assailed by any other power than Great Britain seems in the highest degree improbable. Of course if England has the power to strike us, we have the power to strike back. We can strike at her by land and water. I do not fear such a conflict, and I am glad to believe that such a conflict is not likely to occur. With the growing friendship and community of interests of the two nations there remains only a rivalry of commerce and of friendly offices. I recognize the necessity of building up a strong navy on the Pacific coast, one worthy of the country and able to defend our interests; but this does not require the annexation of Hawaii. Indeed, it renders annexation a matter of wholly secondary and minor importance.

Sir, I object to any policy of alarm and sensation. We are growing faster than any country in the world in wealth and population. Shall we lose our heads and our even balance because we are involved in a brief war with a weak power that is bankrupt and has only one-fourth of our population? This subject of annexation presents wholly different considerations and has nothing properly to do with the Spanish war.

I have already consumed more time than I had designed, but without going into detail or ancient history I have endeavored to present fairly some of the issues involved in the issue of annexation. I have not dwelt upon the commercial aspects of the question. We have a commerce with Hawaii which, while not large, is valuable. But these islands produce nothing of importance that we can not produce at home. Their chief product is sugar. With cheap Asiatic or contract labor these islands are able to produce a good deal of sugar, and this entered free in our ports reduces our revenues and creates a formidable competition to the growing

beet industry on the Pacific coast. This, sir, ought not to be. With an adequate and steady duty on sugar, we can produce from the cane and the beet all the sugar this country can require. The question to be considered is, Shall these great and growing industries of our own people be broken down in order to swell the profits of adventurers and speculators?

If this one factor were removed from the problem, I am confident that we should hear much less of annexation than we have done for some years past. The fever for annexation is not pure sentiment. It is not a Platonic love. It means settlements, money for a certain class of interests, and is essentially a marriage de convenance. It has pressed and maintained the reciprocity treaty. There is mischief enough in that arrangement without adopting a colonial and imperial system which is to change the whole spirit and principle of our American representative Government. [Applause.]

I deny that you can have a colonial system, with inferior and mongrel races and mongrel governments, and standing armies to hold and defend them, without giving up your grand American system of free government with limited powers, State rights, local self-government, and individual freedom. This proposition is self-evident. It requires no argument and no elucidation.

Take this first fatal step and you can not recall it. Much of error we have corrected. Much that may hereafter be you can correct. But when this step shall be taken, you are irrevocably pledged to a system of colonies and empire. There are no foot-steps backward. You may have grandeur. Will you retain liberty?

WE SHOULD DEVELOP DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES.

Is there nothing better? Is there nothing to point the aspirations of our people? I think there is. I do not desire weakness as a people. I rejoice in our strength and growth. We are strong enough to pursue a grand and a glorious destiny. We can be easily the first power of the world if to ourselves only we be true. There are two things I would suggest, one a foreign policy, the other domestic. I have time only to glance briefly at both. In respect to our domestic policy, what is better to develop our happiness and liberty and growth than the cardinal policies of the Democratic party—a respect for the rights of the people and the States, the union of the States, a reverence for the Federal Constitution, an avoidance and hatred of class legislation, low taxation, no monopolies, no bounties to individuals or to classes, no effort to enrich any man at the expense of his neighbor; order, peace, and justice? The doctrines of Jefferson and the fathers, of the most eminent statesmen of the present generation, these will injure no man, but will benefit, bless, and advance the Republic. Under this system there is no limit to our growth; we can then defy all our enemies; we can open a hope for all our people; we can eclipse the glories of any empire of the past or the present; we can command peace and appal any country that would dare be a wrongdoer at our expense. In all this grand chart of progress there are no blood stains, no tears of orphan or widow, no standing armies, no doom for the poor or the humble man aspiring to earn his bread and live in the fear of God. [Applause.]

Thus living and moving we shall have the respect of foreign powers. We shall be strong and we shall not want for friends. Wo



may not join in the vulgar scramble for foreign territory or partake in the partition of Spain or Asia, but we are free to seek foreign markets, and we may say to foreign nations frankly and firmly that we will not allow their schemes of conquest or ambition to shut us out from markets that are fairly ours. We may say that the vast and growing trade of China belongs as fairly to us as to other countries, and that while we do not covet one foot of her soil we will not allow ourselves to be excluded from its commerce. We may not fight to have colonies, dependencies, and subjects, but we may take a start for free access to markets that are ours fairly by our position and growth on the Pacific Ocean. In such a contest we shall have the cooperation of at least one great and powerful nation. We stand only for what is just and right.

I shall not follow out this line of thought, but I submit it as a counter project to the miserable game of grab and incorporation of Asiatics and Malays into a free representative republic, which, if it is to remain great and honored, free and happy, must be a white man's government. I prefer the republican government of our fathers to this scheme of empire and of greed which is sought to be fastened on us by false pretense and appeals to our fears. I speak for the best and highest interests of the American people and not for speculators. I speak for the laboring poor; I speak only what all the fathers of our freedom have told us to believe and act upon. I ask you solemnly to listen to their counsels and to follow their footsteps. [Prolonged applause.]